

**AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWING**

Please replace the original sheet of drawing with the attached replacement sheet of formal drawing figure. In the replacement sheet, reference number 14 is added at the bottom of the figure pursuant to the disclosure in the specification, page 10, line 2.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

**REMARKS**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the present amendments and following discussion, is respectfully requested.

**II. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

Claims 1-13 are pending; claims 1-7 are currently amended; and claims 8-13 are newly added. Claims 1 and 8 are independent claims. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added herewith.

**III. SUMMARY OF THE OFFICE ACTION**

In the outstanding Office Action, the specification is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for being replete with terms that are not clear, concise and exact; claim 5 is objected to for informalities; claims 1-3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Praud et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0095870); claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Praud in view of Szerdahelyi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,715,630); and claims 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Praud in view of Szerdahelyi and Hanson (U.S. Patent No. 3,591,983).

**IV. ARGUMENTS**

**A. The rejection to the specification under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph:**

In the outstanding Office Action, the specification is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for having terms that are not clear, concise and exact. The specification is amended to provide clear, concise, and exact description of the invention, especially the terms in the paragraphs pointed out by the Examiner in the Office Action. For instance, on page 9, line 10,

“(1)” is deleted to prevent confusion between the “door (1)” and the “door lock”. It is respectfully submitted that the specification now complies with the requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

**B. The objection to claim 5:**

In the outstanding Office Action, claim 5 is objected to. The slider in claim 5 refers to the slider in the first assembly (4) as disclosed in the specification, from page 10, line 31 to page 11, line 18. The limitations in claims 5-7 and 11-13 refer to this part of the disclosure. Claims 5-7 are amended to clarify this point. It is respectfully requested that the objection to claim 5 be withdrawn.

**C. The prior art rejections to claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):**

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Praud et al.; claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Praud in view of Szerdahelyi; and claims 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Praud in view of Szerdahelyi and Hanson. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 8 recite a window lift assembly for lifting a window pane in a vehicle, having a first guide and slider assembly (for example, the assembly 4 in the drawing figure) having a first slider fixed to the window pane, and a second guide and slider assembly (for example, the assembly 5) in a track of the window lift assembly, the second guide and slider assembly having a second slider fixed to the window pane.

No prior art reference, taken singly or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests the window lift assembly recited in independent claims 1 and 8. In particular, the prior art references do not teach or suggest a combination of two guide and slider assemblies for a

window lift assembly. Praud shows only one guide and slider assembly 43 in Fig. 1 for lifting the window pane. In the Office Action, the Examiner also points out only one guide and slider assembly 43 and fails to point out a second guide and slider assembly in Praud.

Neither Szerdahelyi nor Hanson cures the deficiencies of Praud. Szerdahelyi does not have two assemblies, as called for in the claimed invention because Fig. 1 of Szerdahelyi shows only one guide and slider assembly formed by the cross-arms 4 and 5.

Hanson shows only one guide and slider mechanism in the lower portion of the door frame. Hanson does not have two guide and slider assemblies, as recited in the claimed invention. In particular, it does not have a guide and slider assembly in the upper portion of the door frame, as recited in claim 8.

Furthermore, independent claim 1 recites first, second, third and fourth distances and their specific relationships with each other. None of the cited prior art discloses, teaches or suggests those distances or their specific relationships. In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner states that one skilled in the art would be motivated to make such design choices for minimal cost or maximum speed in manufacturing. The rejection is respectfully traversed. First, the prior art references do not have the first guide and slider assembly in the door frame, as in the claimed invention. In other words, the prior art references do not have a slider of the first assembly being fixed to the window pane, called for in the claim. Therefore, the prior art references do not have a second distance as recited in claim 1. The prior art references also do not have the points of contact as called for in the claimed invention. In addition, it is not clear which locations or distances in the prior art references corresponding to the claimed first, second,

third, and fourth distances. Therefore, even when one skilled in the art makes design choices, that person would not have had the specific relationships recited in claim 1.

In view of the discussions above, a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to the claimed invention has not been established. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections to claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**V. CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing discussion and present amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to BLANK ROME LLP, Deposit Account No. 23-2185 (001058-00023). In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith and in the event that a separate petition does not accompany this response, Applicants hereby petition under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized above.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Toan Tran

Toan Tran  
Reg. No. 54,942

Date: May 22, 2008

BLANK ROME LLP  
Watergate 600 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037-2485  
(202) 772-5800 (Phone)  
(202) 572-8398 (Facsimile)